

## REMARKS

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

**Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over either GB 1518792 (Slee et al.) or GB 2042704 (Reichert) in view of either US 2006/0091827 A1 (Chevalier et al.) or US 6580309 (Jacobs et al.).** The rejection, as applied to surviving claims 1, 4, and 8, is respectfully overcome by limitations introduced by amendment into claim 1.

Claim 1 now requires an illumination device inside the cryostat chamber that includes “a plurality of illumination modules each having a plurality of LEDs, a plug connector for connecting a power supply system to the illumination module, and a splash protector for protecting the plurality of LEDs of the illumination module.” With the claimed cryostat, illumination modules may be arranged within the cryostat chamber as desired, and illumination modules may be added or removed from the cryostat chamber, to achieve a customized illumination set up depending upon the type of specimen and type of microtome.

As noted previously during prosecution, Slee et al. and Reichert disclose illumination sources located outside the cryostat chamber. In both references, the illumination source is associated with an external microscope looking into the chamber. Consequently, the ability to relocate the illumination source to reconfigure illumination is very limited. Chevalier et al. and Jacobs et al. demonstrate controllable LED modules were known, however their use within a cryostat chamber is not taught. In this regard, it is noted that LEDs were known in the cryostat field long before Chevalier et al. and Jacobs et al., as evidenced by US 5070935 (Sitte et al.) see col. 11, line 19; col. 18, line 40. However, the record lacks any suggestion of using LEDs within a cryostat chamber, despite longtime knowledge of LED’s low heat output and the recognized need for good illumination to ensure safe operation (see applicants’ specification at paragraph [0004]). Thus, at the time of the present invention, the specific solution defined by claim 1 was not obvious.

For these reasons, favorable reconsideration of claims 1, and its dependent claims 4 and 8, is respectfully requested.


**Claims 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over the references cited against claims 1-8, above, and further in view of US 2004/0032729 A1 (Choi et al.) or US 6594075 (Kanao et al.).** Claim 10 is canceled and its limitations incorporated into claim 1; claim 9 is thought to be patentable for the reasons given above with respect to claim 1.

*Conclusion*

The claims have been amended to define a non-obvious cryostat invention. Accordingly, the present application is thought to be in a condition for allowance, and favorable action is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions, or the attorneys for applicant can assist in any way, the undersigned attorney may be contacted at the number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

HODGSON RUSS LLP

By   
George L. Snyder, Jr.  
Reg. No. 37,729

GLS/  
Enc.

The Guaranty Building  
140 Pearl Street, Suite 100  
Buffalo, New York 14202-4040  
(716) 856-4000  
DATED: February 24, 2008